

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERREMARKS

AUG 01 2007

With the cancellation of claims 22, 26 and 27, claims 1, 7, 8, 12 to 14, 16 to 18, 20 and 21 are pending in the present application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 7, 8, 12 to 14, 16 to 18, 20 and 21 for the following reasons..

Applicants acknowledge the entry of the Request for Continued Examination Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 and the amendments contained therein.

1. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 7, 16, 18 AND 26 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

Claims 7, 16, 18 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action states that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The Office Action states that claims 7, 16, 18 and 26, as written, already require photodetectors on the lower surface of the transparent substrate. The Office Action states that the original disclosure does not support the features of the additional photodetectors, on other surfaces of the substrate.

Applicants respectfully traverse the conclusions of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that as provided in the original disclosure of the application on page 6, "As explained above in conjunction with figures 3-6, the photodetector or plurality of photodetectors may be placed in various position on the substrate 710 where they may measure the light waveguided in the substrate, such as on an outer periphery of the upper or lower surface of the substrate 710. The photodetectors 750 feed the measured light to a feedback or compensation factor generator circuit 760, which will be further explained below in connection with Fig. 8" as contained on page 6, paragraph [0026]. The application, therefore, does allow for multiple positions of photodetectors on the substrate as claimed.

As the original application satisfies the requirements of the written description requirement as contained above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections

of claim 7, 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Claim 26 has been cancelled, without prejudice, rendering the rejection moot for this claim.

**II. OBJECTION TO AMENDMENT FILED FEBRUARY 21, 2007 UNDER
35 U.S.C. § 132(A)**

The Office Action states that the amendment filed on February 21, 2007 is objected to as it allegedly introduces new matter into the disclosure. The Office Action states that the added material to claims 7, 16, 18, and 26 require additional photodetectors be located on the upper surface of the transparent substrate and along the side surface of the transparent substrate in addition to the independently claimed lower surface arranged photodetectors. The Office Action states that this material is new matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that, as provided above, there is sufficient written description in the originally filed application to recite the features provided in claims 7, 16, 18 and 26. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the amendment filed on February 21, 2007. Claim 26 has been cancelled, without prejudice, rendering the objection moot for this claim.

**III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 7; 8, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 22, 26 AND 27 UNDER
35 U.S.C. § 103A**

Claims 1, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 22, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over United States Published Application US 2002/0130326 ("Tamura et al.") in view of United States Patent 6,069,676 ("Yuyama"). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 22, 26 and 27 are not rendered obvious to the attempted combination of references for the following reasons.

Claim 1 relates to an array. Claim 1 recites the features of a plurality of light emitting devices disposed over a transparent substrate, the transparent substrate having an upper surface proximal to the light emitting devices, a lower surface distal from the light emitting devices and a plurality of side surfaces, each of the side surfaces being substantially perpendicular to the upper surface, and at least one photodetector arranged on the lower surface of the transparent substrate for detecting light emitted from the light emitting devices.

Claim 14 relates to a method for forming an array comprising the steps of forming a plurality of light emitting devices disposed over a transparent substrate, said transparent substrate having an upper surface proximal to the light emitting devices, a lower surface distal from the light emitting devices and at least one side surface substantially perpendicular to said upper surface of the transparent substrate, and forming a photodetector at the lower surface of the transparent substrate for detecting light emitted through the transparent substrate.

Tamura et al. relate to a lighting device. Title. A plurality of light emitting diodes (LED's) are arranged in at least two-dimensionally dispersed manner that covers the plurality of LED's in an integrated form. Tamura et al. also provide a photo-detecting unit that detects an intensity of light emitted from the plurality of LEDs using a photodetector, the photodetector being arranged inside, on a surface, or in the vicinity of the transparent resin layer. Tamura et al., however, provide the photodetector 9, as provided in Figure 2B, roughly parallel in configuration with the LED 8. The LED 8 and the photodetector 9 are located at approximately the same elevation on the transparent layer 10. Referring to Figure 3B, the photodetector 16 is placed behind spectral filters 18 adjacent to the transparent layer 10. In Tamura et al. Figure 4B, the photodetector 25 is positioned on a same side as the individual light emitting diodes 21, 22, 23 and 24 of the transparent layer 10. Thus, all illustrated and described embodiments provided in the Tamura et al. reference require placement of the photodetector on a same side as the light emitting diodes of the configurations. Tamura et al., in fact, requires that the transparent resin layer satisfy a given thickness, as this the relationship between the position of the light emitting diodes and the photodetector causes the amount of light incident upon the photodetector to be increased as specified in paragraph 0017. The Office Action, in fact, admits this deficiency for both the apparatus and method claims of the present invention as the Tamura et al. reference fails in this regard as noted in section 9 of the Office Action.

The attempted addition of the Yuyama reference does not cure the critical defects of the Tamura et al. reference. Yuyama does not disclose the transparent substrate having an upper surface proximal to the light emitting devices, a lower surface distal from the light emitting devices and a plurality of side surfaces. Yuyama, therefore, is similarly deficient as the Tamura et al. reference.

Yuyama provides a sequential color display device. Title. Yuyama provides in Figure 11, three different light emitting diodes 2a, 2b and 2c at a bottom of a box structure.

An air gap is then presented over top of the light emitting diodes 2a, 2b and 2c. A light diffusion plate 4 with a photosensor 10 attached to a top side of the light diffusion plate. Yuyama does not disclose or suggest any proximal placing of the light emitting devices to the transparent surface. The light emitting diodes are placed at a substantial distance from the light diffusing plate 4. Yuyama, therefore does not disclose a configuration of a light emitting device, a transparent layer, and a photoresistor, or a method using such a configuration as presented in claims 1 and 14 and is therefore similarly deficient to the previously cited Tamara et al. reference.

Claims 7, 8 and 13 depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the features provided in independent claim 1. Claims 7, 8 and 13 are therefore patentable for at least the reasons presented above in relation to claim 1.

Claims 16, 17, 20 depend from claim 14 and therefore include all of the features provided in independent claim 14. Claims 16, 17, 20 are therefore patentable for at least the reasons presented above in relation to claim 14.

Claims 22, 26 and 27 have been cancelled without prejudice, rendering the rejection moot for these claims.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIM 18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103A

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tamura et al. in view of Yuyama and further in view of United States Patent Number 7,026,597 ("Cok"). Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 is not rendered obvious to the attempted combination of references for the following reasons.

Claim 18 ultimately depends from claim 14 and therefore includes all of the features of claim 14.

The deficiencies of the Tamura et al. and Yuyama references are discussed above and are applicable to the rejection including the lack of any proximal placement of the light emitting device to the upper surface of the substrate.

The attempted addition of the Cok reference does not cure the critical deficiencies of the Tamura et al. and Yuyama references. Cok relates to a OLED display with integrated elongated photosensor. The Office Action merely uses the Cok reference to allegedly teach that photodetectors may be formed on an edge of a display.

Applicants respectfully submit that Cok does not disclose or suggest any configuration or method, wherein a plurality of light emitting devices are disposed over a transparent substrate, said transparent substrate having an upper surface proximal to the light emitting device, a lower surface distal from the light emitting device and at least one side surface substantially perpendicular to said upper surface of the transparent substrate; and forming a photodetector at the lower surface of the transparent substrate for detecting light emitted through the transparent substrate. Cok does not disclose or suggest any such surface proximal positioning and is similarly deficient to the Tamura et al. and Yuyama references.

As the attempted combination of references do not disclose or suggest the features of claim 18, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to claim 18.

V. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 12 AND 21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103A

Claims 12 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tamura et al. in view of Yuyama and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,424,326 ("Yamazaki et al."). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12 and 21 are not rendered obvious to the attempted combination of references for the following reasons.

Claim 21 depends from claim 20, and further comprises forming the feedback circuit with a compensation factor generator for generating a compensation factor for each of the plurality of light emitting devices and a memory array for storing the compensation factor for each of the plurality of light emitting devices.

Claim 12 depends from claim 1 and therefore includes all of the features of claim 1.

The deficiencies of the Tamura et al. and Yuyama references are discussed above, including a transparent substrate having an upper surface proximal to the light emitting devices, a lower surface distal from the light emitting devices and a plurality of side surfaces, and are applicable to the rejection. The addition of the Yamazaki et al. reference does not cure the critical deficiencies of the Tamura et al. and Yuyama references.

Yamazaki et al. allegedly relate to a semiconductor display device having a display portion and a sensor portion. Title. The Yamazaki et al. reference is used by the Office Action to recite a display detecting brightness and a memory array for storing a compensation factor for each of the plurality of light emitting devices. The Yamazaki et al. reference, however, does not disclose or suggest a transparent substrate having an upper surface

proximal to the light emitting devices, a lower surface distal from the light emitting devices and a plurality of side surfaces. All three references are deficient in this regard. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to claims 21 and 12.

AUG 01 2007

Patent
Docket No. Y2086/10301CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and a notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

If any point remains that is deemed best resolved through a telephonic conversation, the Office is hereby requested to contact the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,
DUANE MORRIS LLP

Dated: August 1, 2007

John M. Vereb
John M. Vereb
Reg. No. 48,912

1540 Broadway
New York, NY 10036
Direct: (212) 692-1048
Fax: (212) 692-1020
E-mail: JMVerеб@duanemorris.com

CUSTOMER NO. 42109